

Attorney Docket No. BRCK-001/01US

Serial No. 09/960,617

Page 10

REMARKS**Summary**

Claims 7 to 26 remain in the application. In a final Office Action mailed April 11, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 7 to 13, 15 to 19 and 26 in view of certain prior art as indicated below. Claims 20 to 25 were allowed and claim 14 was found to contain allowable subject matter. As described in the following detailed comments claims 7 to 19 have been amended and it is respectfully submitted that these amendments now place all of the pending claims into allowable condition.

Response to the Rejections

Claims 7 to 10, 12, 17 to 19 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a paper by Cai et al. entitled "Automatic Tracking of Human Motion in Indoor Scenes Across Multiple Synchronized Video Streams" (hereinafter the Cai reference). Furthermore the Cai reference is used as a primary reference in the rejection of claims 11, 13, 15 and 16 where claims 11, 15 and 16 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,359,647 to Sengupta while claim 13 is rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,186 to Luke.

The Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 7 to 19 and 26 are patentable over Cai alone or in any combination with Luke and/or Sengupta. More specifically the amended claims have more specifically defined the path(s) associated a given object. These defined paths are not disclosed in or suggested in the Cai reference.

As amended, independent claims 7 and 26 make it clear that there is not simply an "association" between paths and spatial value/time value pairs. Instead the claims are directed to building paths where such value pairs are used to define the paths that are then subjected to processing to determine whether they are related to the same object (see claim 7) or whether they ought to be linked (see claim 26).

It is respectfully submitted that the Cai reference is essentially directed to building a "continuous" video image of a given person as they traverse multiple camera views.

Attorney Docket No. BRCK-001/01US
Serial No. 09/960,617
Page 11

While there is data processing to make decisions as to linking video frames, Cai does not disclose construction of paths defined, at least in part, by a plurality of spatial/time values. The secondary references do not suggest a modification to Cai to create such paths. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 7 and 26, and all of the claims ultimately depending from claim 7, are patentable over Cai taken alone or in combination with Lukc and/or Sergupta.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the finding that claim 14 defines allowable subject matter. In view of the allowability of amended claim 7 Applicants decline to rewrite claim 14 into independent form at this time.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 to 19 and 26 join claims 20 to 25 in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance, which is believed to be in order. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this communication, or the application in general, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at 703-456-8567.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1283.

Dated: May 11, 2006

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
One Freedom Square
Reston Town Center
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5656
Tel: (703) 456-8000
Fax: (703) 456-8100

By:

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP


Frank V. Petrantonio
Reg. No. 32,289